

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/591,442	Applicant(s) SMITH, RAIFE F.	
	Examiner Fred Ferris	Art Unit 2128	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Fred Ferris. (3) Dr. R. Smith (Inventor).
 (2) Doug Swartz (Applicant's Rep.). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 02 June 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 26.

Identification of prior art discussed: N.A..

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Dr. Smith explained that the distribution of packet interarrival times is modeled as a first set (lognormal distribution) and a second set (normal distribution) and is realized by sampling actual network packets. The model accounts for the fact that packet arrivals are payload dependent. Applicant's attorney indicated the desire to write new claims clearly reflecting these features as method steps in the claim language. The examiner indicated that he would favorably consider the allowance of new claims that include such limitations and clearly define the invention over the prior art. .